Civil Works Review Board (CWRB) Project Summary

Project Reviewed: Licking River Basin, Cynthiana, Kentucky

Date of CWRB: 24 March 2006

<u>CWRB Members:</u> MG Johnson (DCG, Chair); MG Riley (DCW); Tom Waters (Planning CoP);

Don Basham (Engineering and Construction CoP); and Ed Hecker (NWD RIT).

Key Participants:

HQUSACE: LRD RIT, (Lawrence Lang, Pat Mutschler, Jonathan Aya-ay), CWRB Members, Office of Water Project Review (Colosimo, Ware, Cone, Warren), Policy and Policy Compliance Division (Leef), Office of Counsel (Nee)

LRD: BG Berwick, Tab Brown.

LRL: Sharon Bond, David Dale, Roger Setters

ASACW: Doug Lamont OMB: Dick Feezle

Sponsor: City of Cynthiana (Mayor Virgie Wells, Michael Hale, Dean Peak)

<u>OWPR Recommendation:</u> Release the report and Environmental Assessment for State and Agency review.

CWRB Decision Made: Approval of release of the report for State and Agency review.

Vote: Unanimous.

Key Issues/Questions Raised by the CWRB (in no particular order):

- 1. Engineering criteria and cost uncertainties of roller compacted concrete dam need to be addressed during Preconstruction Engineering and Design (PED). The CWRB discussion focused on the appropriate level of detail needed for a feasibility study in terms of the use of roller compacted concrete and the potential implications for cost increases in the PED phase if it is determined that roller compacted concrete can not be used.
- 2. Briefing slides contained necessary information of project for CWRB to make a decision.
- 3. Discussion of Level of Protection to be provided by project was held. It was clarified that the project was designed to contain a 100-year event.
- 4. Mitigation. The district clarified for the CWRB that mitigation included in the plan was only to account for the impacts of the project footprint. It was noted by the CWRB members that the description of the mitigation features was inconsistent and confusing.
- 5. CWRB noted that the System of Accounts slide was a good first step in the right direction and that organizationally we need to mature in our analysis of OSE and RED accounts. It was noted that we need to drive home the point that we consider more than traditional economic analyses in our project recommendations.

- 6. The DCG questioned whether a Chief of Engineers report could be completed by June 2006, since the track record has required more time than it should to date. As a result, the June 2006 date may not be reasonable, although technically possible.
- 7. The CWRB noted that this area had been studied before but a federal interest could not be established and wanted to know what had changed. The district indicated that team efforts focused on more innovative solutions, such as the use of roller compacted concrete.
- 8. CWRB members noted that a regional ITR team was used as part of the study review process and the team was commended for taking such proactive steps.
- 9. When the sponsor was asked what the Corps could do better, the sponsor responded that the process took awhile and at this point they are happy to be moving forward. More specifically, the sponsor noted that the project gave the town "hope".

Other Issues of Note: MG Johnson made the Mayor of Cynthiana, Virgie Wells, a honorary engineer due to her participation in the project's ITR team.

Attachment: PowerPoint handout for Licking River Basin - Civil Works Review Board Brief.